RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 6 2096

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0113

REMARKS

This Reply in response to the Office Action mailed on February 17, 2006 in which claims 1-20 were rejected. With this response, claims 1, 10 and 17 are amended. Claims 1-20, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance

I. Rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based upon Jen and Gustafson

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jen et al. US Patent Publication 2002/0194297 in view of Gustafson et al. US Patent Publication 2002/0025085. Claims 1-20, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Jen and Gustafson.

Each of independent claims in the 1, 10 and 17 is amended to clarify the meaning of the limitation "user preference selection field" and the meaning of "customizable selection field". In particular, each of claims 1, 10 and 17 clarify that the user preference selection fields includes defined selection fields and customizable selection fields. "Defined selection fields" present predefined values for an operating parameter from which a user may select. "Customizable selection fields" permit a user to input a customized user preference value for the operating parameter.

As discussed in the specification, the system and method for selecting and presenting user customizable preferences allows a user to see what has been set as a custom preference without having to go into secondary dialog boxes. See page 2, paragraph [0005]. In an exemplary embodiment, a drop down box of user specified preferences may include a number of selection fields or items including a Custom preference selection field or item. See, Figure 2, page 5, paragraph [0020]. A user may select the "Custom" preference selection field and enter a value to specify a user-defined preference. See, Figure 2 and Figure 4, page 5, paragraph [0020]. Once the custom value has been entered, the custom value is presented in the list of selection fields with the custom selection field, for example, in parenthesis next to the "Custom" selection field. See, Figure 4, page 6, paragraph [0024]. Accordingly, the user is able to see the value set as the customized selection in the drop down box (or user

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0113

preference selection list). See, Figure 4, paragraph [0024]. In other words, the user preferences selection list is modified so that the custom value input by the user is readily visible.

Neither Jen nor Gustafson, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a method (claim 1), a user interface (claim 10) or a processing system (claim 17), wherein a list of user preference selection fields including defined selection fields and customizable selection fields are presented, wherein defined selection fields present predefined values for an operating parameter from which a user may select and wherein customizable selection fields permit a user to input a customized user preference value for the operating parameter. In contrast, Jen merely discloses a list of information fields in Figure 7 in which a user may enter information. Such information fields of Jen do not permit a user to input a customized user preference value for an operating parameter that is presented along with defined selection fields presenting predefined values for the same operating parameter from which a user may select. Filling in a blank with one's name or address does not constitute entering a customized value for an operating parameter. Moreover, predefined values from which a user may select for the same operating parameter are clearly not presented by Jen.

Gustafson does not satisfy the deficiencies of Jen. Although Gustafson appears to provide a drop-down list of predefined values for an operating parameter from which a user may select in Figure 9 (the "Arial" value for text font), nowhere does Gustafson disclose additionally providing a customizable selection field in which a user input customized user preference value is displayed with the predefined values.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that would be obvious to combine the teachings of Jen and Gustafson, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to disclose a list of user preference selection fields including both defined selection fields and customizable selection fields, where the customizable selection field includes a display of an input customized user preference value. At most, the hypothetical combination would result in a first screen presenting blanks by which a user may enter information (per Jen) and a second screen presenting the defined selection fields (per Gustafson). Accordingly, claims 1, 10 and 17, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Jen and Gustafson. Claims 2-9, 11-16

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0113

and 18-20 depend from claims 1, 10 and 17, respectively, and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3815.

	Respectfully submitted,	
Date	By	
	Todd A. Rathe Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 38,276	